



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,798	09/12/2003	H. Paul Redmond	1194-282	6154

6449 7590 12/15/2005

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

COOK, REBECCA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

No support is seen for using 5-FU to inhibit the scope of tumor growth recited in the instant claims and the recitation I the claims "substantially reducing toxic side effects of 5-FU" in parents 10/281,138 or 09/583,902. '481 recites that 5-FU can be used in combination with Taurolidine and/or Taurulatam after surgical resection of glioblastoma (column 9, lines 39-42).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not understood what is meant by the word "substantially" in claims 1 and 10 in the recitations "substantially enhancing antineoplastic effects" and "substantially reducing toxic side effects" and it is not seen that they are defined in the specification. Does it mean that a synergistic effect is seen using the method of using the combination of 5-FU and the methylol transfer agent? Does it mean, e.g., that the patient loses less hair, has fewer mouth sores, is less tired. It is not clear which side effects are reduced or how the reduction is measured and is not seen that it is described in the specification.

In claim 1, line 2 the term 5-FU is indefinite. The first time an abbreviation is used in a claim it should be preceeded by the term for which it is an abbreviation.

In claim 10 it is not clear that a combination is being claimed. Amending the claim to recite "A combination comprising 5-Fluorouracil (5-FU) and a methylol transfer agent..." will overcome this rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of WO 92/00743 .

Carter discloses that 5-FU is useful to treat the instantly recited cancers. Carter does not disclose a method of using taurolidine or taurultam to treat cancer. However, WO 92/00743 (pages 1-3) discloses a method of using taurolidine and taurultam to treat cancer.

"[I]t is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition and use it in a method for the very same purpose...[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven* 105 USPQ 1069. Therefore, in the absence of a showing of unexpected results, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine 5-FU and taurolidine or taurultam to yield the instant composition and use it in a method to treat cancer, since each is individually taught in the prior art to be useful to treat cancer.

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of US 6,303,596.

Carter discloses that 5-FU is useful to treat the instantly recited cancers. Carter does not disclose a method of using taurolidine or taurultam to treat cancer. However, US 6,303,596 (abstract, claims) discloses a method of using taurolidine and taurultam to treat cancer.

"[I]t is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition and use it in a method for the very same purpose...[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven* 105 USPQ 1069. Therefore, in the absence of a showing of unexpected results, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine 5-FU and taurolidine or taurultam to yield the instant composition and use it in a method to treat cancer, since each is individually taught in the prior art to be useful to treat cancer.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1614

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,479,481 in view of the disclosure in '481. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '481 discloses a method of treating tumors using the methylol transfer agents taurolidine, taurultam or a mixture thereof and that it may be combined with 5-FU to treat glioblastoma (column 9, lines 13-43).

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

Monson (10), Monson (11) and Weberchock were not received and therefore could not be considered.

#### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (571) 272-0951.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Renee Jones (571) 272-0547 in Customer Service.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1614

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The official fax number is 571-273-8300.

Rebecca Cook

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rebecca Cook", written in a cursive style.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1614

December 8, 2005